

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of BRANDON SCOTT MEADE,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GLORIA GUILFOIL,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MARTIN MEADE,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

July 20, 2004

No. 253665

Tuscola Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 02-008136-NA

Before: Jansen, P.J., and Meter and Cooper, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to her youngest child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i), (b)(ii), (c)(i), and (j). We affirm.

The testimony of the child and the child's foster mother indicated that Ralph Vermillion and Shawn Jefferson sexually abused the child. Respondent-appellant's granddaughter was also involved as a victim in this sexual abuse. The trial court found from the evidence that respondent-appellant failed to stop this sexual abuse and that, in fact, she was present during it and took photographs. Moreover, despite the fact that Vermillion impregnated respondent-appellant's daughter when she was fifteen years old and was subsequently extremely violent, respondent-appellant did not take sufficient steps to remove Vermillion from her household. Respondent-appellant's psychological evaluation, her history of making poor choices with regard to her children and grandchildren, and her denial of the sexual abuse of the child evidenced that respondent-appellant would be unable to protect the child in the future, despite extensive services

provided to her. In light of all the evidence, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).¹

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The child had at one point stated that he did not want to return to respondent-appellant until he was older and could protect himself. Expert testimony indicated that reunification would destabilize the child's feelings of safety. There was also evidence showing a risk of future harm from respondent's shortcomings and her failure to protect the child. The trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen
/s/ Patrick M. Meter
/s/ Jessica R. Cooper

¹ We note that only statutory ground is necessary to support a termination order. *In re Powers Minors*, 244 Mich App 111, 118; 624 NW2d 472 (2000).